

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SAMUEL DAVIS

Plaintiff,

- AGAINST -

CORRECTION OFFICER RHOOMES, ET AL.

Defendants.

JOHN G. KOELTL, District Judge:

The plaintiff's application for appointment of counsel filed October 12, 2007 is **denied** at this time without prejudice to renewal.

For the Court to order the appointment of counsel, the plaintiff must, as a threshold matter, demonstrate that his claim has substance or a likelihood of success on the merits. See Hodge v. Police Officers, 802 F.2d 58, 61-62 (2d Cir. 1986). Only then can the Court consider the other factors appropriate to determination of whether counsel should be appointed:

"plaintiff's ability to obtain representation independently, and his ability to handle the case without assistance in the light of the required factual investigation, the complexity of the legal issues, and the need for expertly conducted cross-examination to test veracity." Cooper v. A. Sargent Co., Inc., 877 F.2d 170, 172 (2d Cir. 1989).

07 CIV. 6322 (JGK)

ORDER

USDS SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: 12/06/07

At this point in the proceedings, the Court denies the plaintiff's application for appointment of counsel without prejudice to renewal because the Court cannot determine based on the record that the plaintiff's claims are substantial or that he is likely to succeed on the merits.

The plaintiff should work with the Pro Se Office of the Court for any additional help that he needs and should also seek to obtain private counsel. The Pro Se Office may be contacted at: Pro Se Office, United States District Court, S.D.N.Y., 500 Pearl St, New York, N.Y. 10007, 212-805-0175.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York
November 6, 2007


John G. Koeltl
United States District Judge